

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9                   WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
10                  AT TACOMA  
11

12                  ZAIRA JANETH OLIVAS ONTIVEROS,  
13                  Petitioner  
14                  v.  
15                  OSCAR FERNANDO ORTEGA PINION,  
16                  Respondent.

CASE NO. 3:24-cv-05700-DGE  
ORDER DENYING MOTION TO  
APPOINT GUARDIAN AD LITEM  
(DKT. NO. 20)

16                  Presently before the Court is Respondent's motion to appoint a Guardian ad Litem. (Dkt.  
17 No. 20.) Respondent argues that it is "imperative that a neutral and impartial individual" be  
18 appointed to represent the interests of his minor child. (*Id.*) Petitioner argues the Court should  
19 deny Respondent's motion because there are no issues before the Court which would benefit  
20 from the assistance of a Guardian. (Dkt. No. 24.)

21                  This matter involves a claim of unlawful retention under the Hague Convention. At its  
22 core, the Petition asks the Court to determine whether the minor child was wrongfully retained.  
23 The objects of the Hague Convention are: (1) "to secure the prompt return of children wrongfully  
24

1 removed to or retained in any Contracting State,” and (2) “to ensure that rights of custody and of  
 2 access under the law of one Contracting State are effectively respected in other Contracting  
 3 States.” Hague Convention, art. 1; *see also* [22 U.S.C. § 9001\(a\)](#).

4       “Although the court has broad discretion and need not appoint a guardian ad litem if it  
 5 determines the person is or can be otherwise adequately protected, it is under a legal obligation  
 6 to consider whether the person is adequately protected.” *United States v. 30.64 Acres of Land*,  
 7 795 F.2d 796, 805 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1986).

8       “Children are not usually parties to Hague Convention proceedings, though nothing in the  
 9 Convention expressly prohibits a court from allowing children to intervene.” *Sanchez v. R.G.L.*,  
 10 761 F.3d 495, 508 (5th Cir. 2014). “District courts have sometimes allowed children to  
 11 participate through *guardians ad litem* when their interests were not adequately represented by  
 12 either party.” *Id.* “Granting the children representation in appropriate situations is consistent  
 13 with the Supreme Court’s view that ‘courts can achieve the ends of the [Hague] Convention and  
 14 ICARA—and protect the well-being of the affected children—through the familiar judicial tools  
 15 . . .’” *Id.* (quoting *Chafin v. Chafin*, 568 U.S. 165, 178 (2013)).

16       While the Court has the authority to appoint a Guardian ad Litem, there is no indication  
 17 that the child’s interests are not being adequately represented, nor does the Court find that a  
 18 Guardian would be useful or necessary in determining whether the minor child was wrongfully  
 19 retained. *See Mahjoubi v. Roper*, Case No. 6:24-cv-01358-AA, 2024 WL 4678542 at \*2 (D. Or.  
 20 Nov. 5, 2024). Accordingly, Respondent’s motion for appointment of a Guardian ad Litem (Dkt.  
 21 No. 20) is DENIED.

22                   Dated this 2nd day of January, 2025.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24



David G. Estudillo  
United States District Judge